

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Miyamoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,701,402) in view of Ueno (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,812). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner concedes that Miyamoto does not explicitly disclose a second destination information as recited in claim 1, or a first unused address as recited in claim 8. However, the Examiner asserts that item 21 of Figure 2 of Ueno discloses various items stored in an EEPROM of a printer cartridge and thereby overcomes the deficiencies of Miyamoto. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As shown in the first embodiment of Ueno (col. 4, lines 54-64), a printer controller prohibits a print option of the printer if an error exists in the information stored in the read-only area 20 which includes the data area A21. Furthermore, in the second embodiment of Ueno (col. 6, lines 57-64), standard data which has previously been stored in the standard ROM 8 is treated as reference data if an error exists in the read-only area 20 which includes the data area A21. In other words, the data included in the data area A21 is used to control the print operation of the printer, and is therefore not “second destination information not to be used to control the printing operation” as recited in claim 1. Additionally, as shown in Figure 2 of Ueno, and described at col. 5, lines 3-12, and col. 7, lines 5-14, data included in the readable area 25 is also used for controlling the printing operation of the printer, and is therefore not “a first unused address at which a prescribed value is stored and of which use by the control system of the main body of the image forming device is not defined” as recited in claim 8.

Consequently, Ueno fails to overcome the deficiencies of Miyamoto conceded to by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 1 and 8 are therefore allowable over the combination of Miyamoto and Ueno.

Claims 2-7 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Miyamoto in view of Ueno and Hirst (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,553). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Hirst does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Miyamoto and Ueno as discussed above with regard to claims 1 and 8, nor has the Examiner cited Hirst as overcoming these deficiencies. Accordingly, claims 2-7 and 9-11, which depend from allowable base claims, are allowable due at least to their respective dependencies.

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Miyamoto in view of Ueno and Hirst, and in further view of applicants' admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 12 recites features similar to those discussed above. Applicants' admitted prior art does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Miyamoto, Ueno and Hirst noted above. Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 13-15 depend from allowable claim 12 and are therefore allowable due at least to their respective dependencies.


Claims 16-20 have been added to round out the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added.

Applicants solicit an early action allowing the claims.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief, including extensions of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Attorney Docket No. 204552021000.

Dated: December 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Adam Keser

Registration No. 54,217  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7301 – Telephone  
(703) 760-7777 – Facsimile